

A Study on Adjudicator's Oral Feedback in British Parliamentary Debate of EDS UNESA

Umi Mayzuhroh

English Education, Language and Art Faculty, State University of Surabaya

Maymahmud16@gmail.com

Abstrak

Peran umpan balik juri saat debat sangatlah penting. Ada tiga aspek debat yang harus diperhatikan oleh juri saat memberi umpan balik yaitu, isi, gaya, dan metode. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menginvestigasi aspek-aspek debat yang menjadi fokus juri saat memberi umpan balik dan respon pelaku debat terhadap umpan balik tersebut. Penelitian ini adalah kualitatif penelitian. Penelitian ini diadakan di EDS (Klub Debat Bahasa Inggris) Unesa dan subyek utama penelitian ini adalah satu juri debat dan dua pelaku debat sebagai tim yang diunggulkan di klub tersebut. Peneliti menggunakan pengamatan dan wawancara untuk mengumpulkan data. Peneliti menemukan bahwa aspek yang menjadi fokus juri debat dalam memberi umpan balik adalah aspek isi terutama alasan. Umpan balik terkait metode diberikan secara terintegrasi dengan aspek isi. Peneliti hampir tidak menemukan umpan balik terkait gaya. Peneliti hanya menemukan umpan balik tentang presentasi vokal yang merupakan satu komponen dari aspek gaya. Di sisi lain, peneliti juga menemukan bahwa respon pelaku debat terhadap umpan balik tersebut berbeda-beda. Namun demikian, peneliti dapat menyimpulkan bahwa semua pelaku debat memahami dan merasa nyaman dengan umpan balik yang diberikan oleh juri debat. Peneliti menyarankan supaya penelitian tentang strategi pelaku debat dalam mempelajari feedback bisa diadakan.

Kata Kunci : Debat, Respon Pelaku Debat, Umpan Balik Lisan, Juri Debat, Debat Parlemen Gaya British

Abstract

The role of adjudicator's feedback in debate is decidedly important. There are three aspects of debate that the adjudicator needs to consider in giving feedback, namely matter, manner and method. The purpose of this present study is to investigate what aspect are the focus of adjudicator in providing feedback and debater's responses to the feedback. This study is qualitative research. It has been conducted in EDS (English Debating Society) of Unesa and the main subjects were one single adjudicator and two debaters as the winning team of EDS Unesa. The researcher used observation and interview to collect the data. The researcher found that the adjudicator mostly concerned on aspect of matter especially reasoning. Surprisingly, the researcher hardly found feedback about manner aspect. The feedback of method was given integrated with matter. The researcher also concluded that responses to the feedback were various. Nevertheless, the researcher found that all debaters understand the feedback given by the adjudicator and consider it very helpful. The researcher suggested that another study about debater's strategy to learn from the feedback can be conducted.

Keyword: *Debate, Debater's Responses, Oral Feedback, Adjudicator, British Parliamentary Style*

INTRODUCTION

As an interactive activity, debate always has two conflicting sides arguing each other in order to ultimately find the most fair and solutive ways in overcoming problems within certain motion. However, debate is really different from discussion although both activities are interactive activities and are used to find out solutions. Meany & Shuster (2003) say one thing that distinguishes debate from simple argument in discussion is that in debate, debaters are trying to persuade a third party. This third party is usually called adjudicator. Practically, there are many kinds of debate format but Harvey (2011) claims that the most international and fastest-growing format of competitive debate is World

Style Debating which refers to British Parliamentary Debate. This kind of Parliamentary Debate is widely used in many debate tournaments. Harvey (2011) states British Parliamentary Style has four conflicting teams that every two of which are in the same stance.

Despite the fact that the most leading part of debate is the debaters' speech performance, the part when the adjudicator is giving their comments at the end of the debate is also important. Harvey (2011) states that once the debate is over, the adjudicator is required to announce the result and give verbal feedback over the debate. They need to explain the reasons for decision and offering advice on areas in which debaters can improve. Thornburry (2015) states that without clear feedback of

pupils' need, the relative increment given to different skill will be difficult to judge. Equally, the adjudicator is necessarily to look at shortages within the debate that the debaters need to improve. Due to the fact that the debaters' shortages are diversely, the adjudicator has to be aware in analyzing certain shortages of each debater from the very first time. Hattie & Timperley (2007) states that feedback is one of the most prevailing influences on learning and achievement since it is the consequence of a performance. Through feedback, the debaters can look up the answers to evaluate the correctness of the response.

To my best knowledge, as a debater, surprisingly, the problems that happen in common debate is that the adjudicator did not provide an appropriate feedback contributing the debaters' development. Although there are some criteria that they need to consider in judging the debate, such as matter, manner, and method, the debaters still felt disappointed due to the appearance of unsubstantiated and unreasonably feedback given afterwards.

There are criteria of judging debate namely, matter, manner, and method. In world style, they are called respectively equal to content, style, and strategy. These criteria are the aspects of debate that all judges need to consider to assess the debate. Through these criteria also, the judges will find areas of debate that they could give or comment as feedback for debaters' improvement. Quinn (2015) asserts that it is highly important to consider the weightings of these criteria. First, matter and manner (content and style) are valued equally. Many debaters and supporters automatically assume that a team which presents well should win the debate – this is not necessarily the case. Second, method (strategy) is only valued half as significantly as matter and manner, but is still prevailing. Nevertheless, although it is weighted less, method can and does directly affect the result of many debates

Even though feedback in debate takes very important roles, numerous research about debate is less likely to investigate adjudicator's feedback. Therefore, a study about adjudicator's feedback especially in EDS Unesa debating training has been conducted. The debate was in British Parliamentary style.

Based on the background of the study, the researcher formulates two research questions as follows:

1. What aspects of debate are the focuses of the adjudicator in providing feedback in British Parliamentary Debate in EDS Unesa?
2. How do the debaters respond to the feedback of the adjudicator in British Parliamentary Debate in EDS Unesa?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study is descriptive qualitative research. The purpose of this study is to find out what aspects of debate are the focus of the adjudicator in providing feedback in British Parliamentary Debate of EDS Unesa. Not to mention, the researcher described the debater's responses to the feedback. The researcher was going to address two research questions, i.e., what aspects of debate are the focus of the adjudicator in providing feedback and how the debaters respond to the feedback. British Parliamentary debate had been conducted in EDS Unesa training.

In qualitative research, the researcher herself is the foremost instrument for data collection and analysis (Ary et al, 2010). However, the researcher still needed other methods to help her collect the data to address her research questions. To address first research question, the researcher used her notes in order to record all information about adjudicator's feedback. In this notes, by then, the researcher excerpted the information from video tape recorder she had used in collecting the data of utterances containing adjudicator's feedback. The researcher also utilized codebook to assist her assemble and analyze those particular data. To confirm the data, the researcher interviewed the adjudicator about feedback he had provided.

To find out the answer of second research question, the researcher used her field notes and interview guideline. Field note was chosen to observe debater's behaviors in responding to feedback given by adjudicator while interview was done to validate the debater's thoughts doing that responses when retorting the feedback.

After collecting all the data through observation and interview, the researcher analyzed the data as follows:

1. The researcher played the video recorded and transcribed all the parts of the speech from adjudicator and the debaters.
2. The researcher classified all words, phrases, or sentences that indicate feedback on aspect of debate into different piece of paper.
3. The researcher analyzed the feedback. She used her note and codebook to find out what are aspect of debate that becomes the focus of the adjudicator when providing feedback. It was very beneficial for her to answer the first questions.
4. The researcher might formulate several codes to help her analyze the data. The codes that were used maybe combination between pre-determined codes and the codes that would emerge from data.
5. The researcher interpreted the data by considering the frequency of debate aspects that the adjudicator frequently mentioned in his feedback. By doing this,

the researcher got the answer of the first research question.

6. In order to know the adjudicator's perspective in focusing on particular aspect, the researcher continued to analyze the interview result. The researcher played the recording of interview with adjudicator and transcribed it.
7. The researcher categorized all phrases or sentences of adjudicator's statement regarding his outlook in focusing on certain aspect of debate. For example, he stated *"I focus on defining motion aspect because it contextualizes the debate"*. It was very beneficial for her to address the first research question.
8. To answer the second research question, the researcher familiarized herself with her field notes by reading them more frequently.
9. The researcher identified what sentences or phrases she had written in her field notes indicating debaters' activities to respond the feedback. Example of the statement could be *"the debaters said I understand"*.
10. The researcher continued to analyze the interview result. The researcher played the recording of interview with debaters and transcribed it.
11. The researcher pigeonholed all words or sentences produced by debaters regarding to their thoughts in responding the feedback such as when they said *"I said that because I just know the nature of law."*
12. Lastly, the researcher interpreted the results by representing them in narrative passage. The researcher also intertwined them with the existing related theories.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Adjudicator's Focus in Providing Feedback

The researcher found the aspect of debate that is habitually focused by the adjudicator is **matter** aspect. In matter aspect, the parts that he mostly focused was reasoning since the researcher found the adjudicator frequently mentioned feedback about it. Other part in matter aspects that he expounded in his feedback were rebuttal, stance, model, argument, definition, and example. All components of matter aspect were exposed in the feedback. The feedback about method was also given but the portion was not as rich as matter. It was all about strategy. The organization component was not mentioned. Surprisingly, the researcher hardly found the feedback about manner aspect. Feedback about manner was only given on vocal presentation aspect. Other components such as visual presentation, verbal presentation, and general pointers were barely provided.

Findings from analysis of feedback showed almost all his feedback contained correction to the cases or the

content that should be brought by debaters. The researcher reported that all parts of matter, namely definition, stance, model, argument, reasoning, and example, in debate were being his concern. From the stance to the example, he elucidated clear and detail. Based on this provision, the researcher considered the adjudicator focused on matter.

A little attention was put on method aspect. Method is basically ways to structure cases in speech. The adjudicator gave feedback about method integrated with matter. In short, when he revealed corrective feedback about stance, for instance, he also pointed out how to give proper stance in certain cases of debate. Most remarkably, adjudicator was found barely discuss about manner. Only suggestion regarding to speed as vocal presentation aspect he had said to debaters.

Below, the researcher explicated the adjudicator's verbatim feedback. The researcher reported her justification on why some utterances were indicating particular parts in either matter or manner or method. In the first observation, the adjudicator gave debaters s motion *THBT public university should only offer seats for students who are willing to sign a binding contract stating that they will pursue career in their field of study (for example: students of English Education Department will be a teacher, law students will work in law firm, etc.*

Table 1. Feedback in the First Meeting of Observation

Feedback	Explanation
<i>Your rebuttal was extremely unclear. In case, OG set up an urgency, you only rebut is by saying "I want to neutralize the urgency or the problem of OG."</i>	This feedback was considered to method. It might sound like matter feedback but it is method because the adjudicator gave strategy to rebut the urgency made by the opponent. A strategy he offered might neutralizing the wrong set up of opponent.
<i>If it comes to stance, it doesn't mean you directly stated stance as the motion is in which I was very confused to understand what your team stands for. You better say, what we stand for, we stand for no binding contract for students.</i>	It belonged to matter of stance because the researcher found the adjudicator told debaters team position regarding to motion. He stated that debaters should only say standing for no binding contract rather than read all words in the motion
<i>We stand for no binding contract at all in</i>	The researcher considered it model aspect because the

<i>enrollment of students in public university.</i>	feedback contained the steps that will be implemented as to support stance. He stated no contract in any enrollment.	<i>is also minimum. For example, students of Javanese department which is the job field is very limited.</i>	about Javanese major that its job field is limited.
<i>I want to respond the case of OG in the cue of neutralizing the problem. Say! OG hyperbolically talked about the idea of economic deprivation. You have to say "well we have been so progressive"</i>	It was clear that this feedback is about rebuttal. The adjudicator offered to rebut case about economic deprivation, debaters need to say progress occurred in such country.	<i>When you are locked in certain job that other opportunity is more likely compensating your life, this is unfair for you. You can get better future rather than staying in certain job.</i>	This belonged to reasoning because the adjudicator elaborated with problem of stuckness so that it was unfair.
<i>If you were in OO, you only rebut the core problem, such as their core urgency. Only one! Instead of you talk around the bush and it makes your speech bad. It also wastes your time</i>	It belonged to method strategy because the adjudicator gave tips to have better rebut. He said one rebuttal is enough rather than more rebuttals but no irrelevancy at all.	<i>The practical harms is you cannot do self-actualization. You cannot maximize your potential ability.</i>	This belonged to reasoning because there was adjudicator's statement about self-actualization as practical harm.
<i>You say, all of this is very unfair for during the process of learning, this interrelated with employment process in the future.</i>	It belonged to reasoning because the adjudicator acclaimed that binding contract requirement is not fair at all if it is interrelated to the occupation process in the future.	<i>Maybe he study at English Literature, but he has good leadership that can be utilized to be CEO in certain start-up.</i>	The adjudicator provided concrete depiction regarding to self-actualization. He mentioned about the uncertainty.
<i>That public university obligation is giving as good as possible to its students. It is not the case of future career, it is really not the responsibility of educational institution.</i>	It belonged to reasoning because the adjudicator explained that the obligation of university is not making students to work in certain firms but it is the case of giving appropriate educational service.		
<i>We have problem of job field availability which is corresponding to educational background of each person. You say, this is evil when government implements this proposal but they do not fix the problems and systems which is availability of job field is not properly there.</i>	Again, the adjudicator explained clearly reasons to strengthen the argument. They elucidated that in status quo there is job field availability.		
<i>You say for those who study in popular major which is the job vacancy</i>	This feedback was considered example since the adjudicator explained		

In second observation, there was no feedback because the debate was on the same motion. The only feedback found by the researcher in her notes was about manner. It was related to vocal presentation, namely speed.

Table 2. Feedback in the Second Meeting of Observation

Feedback	Explanation
<i>Can you just be faster than this when speech?</i>	This belonged to speed which is related to vocal presentation in manner aspect.

The third meeting of observation, the adjudicator gave different motion, that is *THW pardon eco terrorism*. Here are the feedback;

Table 3. Feedback in the Third Meeting of Observation

Feedback	Explanation
<i>In case, it is pardon, what you need to bring from the beginning is your tolerance action that will be implemented.</i>	In the third day observation, the adjudicator gave different motion. The first feedback was about strategy to construct stance.
<i>You better say "in a court where eco terrorist against company or other entities who are doing</i>	It belonged to model because the adjudicator explained the ideal mechanism the debaters

<i>excessive pollution, we need to take side on eco terrorists." Added with "we will pardon eco terrorists if their opponent is proven doing excessive pollution and we will punish eco terrorists if their opponent is not proven doing pollution."</i>	need to bring under the stance of pardoning eco terrorism.
<i>This kind of motion needs explicit model or clear mechanism. You need to consider intonation. So you emphasizes this part of mechanism.</i>	It indicated manner since the adjudicator gave feedback about manner related to vocal presentation. It was specifically about intonation.
<i>You say, "eco terrorism is acts of violence done in maintenance of ecological or environmental causes, against individuals or their asset."</i>	It belonged to definition part because the adjudicator explain the meaning and context of eco terrorism.
<i>The first reason, they who commit environmental pollution can no longer be tolerated. They have been warned through negotiation, fine, or even ultimatum to discontinuing company.</i>	The feedback was categorized as reasoning part because the adjudicator supposed principle reasons to support pardoning eco terrorism.
<i>You can also say, look as environmentalist, they even take over government's responsibility in which they are unable against the company.</i>	This feedback was again about reasoning since the adjudicator said eco terrorism take over government's responsibility to handle environmental disruption.
<i>It will alert other companies so that they will be panic if they commit environmental pollution. You say, what is done in eco terrorism involves destroying and also threatening.</i>	This belonged to reasoning part because the adjudicator offered eco terrorism action warned other companies to not do any pollution.

As the researcher found the adjudicator focused on matter aspect, she clarified to adjudicator by conducting interview. When the researcher asked about that, the adjudicator said he indeed concerned on matter. He thought that in modern debate, most adjudicators weighted matter as the main criteria to assess the debaters. However, he had not totally overlooked other aspects like manner and method. He stated, he did not need to explain method because he was sure that all debaters understand basic method of debate. Method that he concerned was about strategy or tactic to construct more proper matter. For example, in his feedback, he explained to debaters about strategy to rebut if the opponent made the wrong set up. He said what debaters needed to do was by neutralizing it and depicting the correct condition. As such, he elaborated by explaining economic progress to debunk the idea of deprivation that the opponent had pointed out.

When the researcher clarified the adjudicator regarding the feedback about reasoning that had been frequently given, the adjudicator said that strong reasoning resulted strong argument. Debaters need to provide strong argument to win the debate. The more reasons they offered, the stronger argument they would have. He added there are another party that debaters need to consider, that is the adjudicator. As debaters, they had to convince and persuade the adjudicator. Their role was to prove their team's stance was right and opponent's was wrong. Therefore, the adjudicator decided to allocate his feedback mostly on aspect of matter reasoning.

When the researcher asked the adjudicator regarding feedback about manner, he answered that it was given limited in every training. He stated that the only feedback he gave was about speed and intonation. He provided reason that he could not change debaters' natural style of speaking. When the researcher asked whether or not the adjudicator would focus on matter aspect, he confidently verified it.

The researcher found that the data from interview corresponds to the data from observation. The adjudicator indeed mostly concerned about matter aspect. When the researcher asked the reason behind, the adjudicator asserted that in most modern debate tournaments, the adjudicator valued more in content. However, he did not oversee aspect of manner. He still mentioned slightly comments about manner but it was not his focus in providing feedback. As a result, the adjudicator expected that the debaters still consider the aspect of manner especially speed and intonation.

The first thing that the adjudicator concerned was the team's ability of making rebuttal. This might be because rebuttal was necessarily carried on the first

beginning of every speech in debate except Prime Minister (Quinn, 2015). He directly gave feedback what should be done by the debaters. The adjudicator was realizing that the debaters' ability to construct rebuttal was not good so he immediately explain what they actually have to do in making rebuttal. This feedback was a type of negative feedback. Rydhal (2005) asserts that negative feedback is feedback that is used to help students understand what has to be changed. It also happened to the part of matter which is stance. The adjudicator also corrected the stance that the Leader of Opposition needed to stand for.

In term of arguments, there was no arguments from the debaters valued by the adjudicator except the fluctuation of need that was mentioned by the Deputy Leader of Opposition. The adjudicator brought newly material that debaters had not thought about. It was about why signing binding contract policy is inherently wrong. The argument might be simply like that but the elaboration to support such title of argument was extremely rich. Brookhart (2008) claims that feedback can be powerful if the feedback giver can do well. This is meant to expect that the second rehearsal of debaters was much better than the first one. Since the feedback from the adjudicator was focused on the matter and his explanation was very understandable by the audience. He simply oftentimes made sure that the debaters comprehend with the newly cases he brought by saying "Got it?" "Right?" etc. Another feedback about argument was given to the Deputy Leader of Opposition. It was about the extension of team's arguments. Harvey (2011) states that the role of Deputy Leader of Opposition is to support their partners as well as add new arguments as their team's case extension.

Most interestingly, the aspect of reasoning became the main focus of the adjudicator's feedback. As noted in results, the adjudicator mentioned reasoning feedback 10 times. He thought that with strong reasoning, the argument would be stronger. Quinn (2015) states that in making argument, there are three parts should be considered namely, assertion or label, reasoning or explanation, example and tie-back. In the part of explanation, Quinn (2015) suggests that ideal reasoning should be a few sentences long. In the case of complex or subtle reasoning, debaters may need more. Moreover, Harvey (2011) states that debaters would be more comfortable if they have plenty of explanation supporting the arguments. At the end of this part, their average audience member should be thinking why the argument should be true. Two motion about binding contract and eco terrorism required debaters to have more reasoning so that their argument would be stronger and the audience or even the adjudicator could credit the

argument more. As a result, their scores would eventually better than opponent's. The adjudicator provided the feedback about reasoning detailed explanation and repeatedly. Kimova (2015) argue that "the more frequent and constructive this feedback is, the more performance improvement can be done." So that the reasoning feedback should be given oftentimes so that debaters can improve themselves in making reasoning.

Surprisingly, feedback about manner was given limited. It was about speed and intonation. Quinn (2015) states that speed and intonation belongs to vocal presentation aspect of manner. The result of interview also showed that (2011) asserts that in World Debating Championship, most adjudicator valued matter aspects more rather than manner. It actually corresponds to the adjudicator's statement that in modern debate, matter aspects are being the adjudicator focus to decide which team win the debate. Furthermore, Quinn (2015) states that there is nothing that can change someone's original style of speaking. It was actually positive to the adjudicator's statement that he could not correct debater's natural speaking grace.

Debater's Responses to Feedback

Second research question in this study is about debater's responses. What researcher means by responses is to the extent of debater's reaction during the adjudicator was delivering feedback. The researcher found several activities done by debaters in responding the feedback. Those are:

- Immediately wrote down feedback in a newly blank sheet
- Producing utterance "Yes..."
- Producing utterance "Hmm..."
- Producing utterance "I got it..." and nodding
- Didn't ask anything about the debate or the motion (Debater B)
- Producing utterances "Oh..."
- Asking something to the adjudicator. It was about how to be a good second speaker. (Debater A)

Although there were many similar activities they did or utterances they produced, the responses from both debaters were quite different. The striking difference relies on their activeness. Debater A responded the feedback by asking question while Debater B did not ask anything to the adjudicator in three meetings of observation. The researcher then did interview with the debaters to ensure their responses.

To begin with, the researcher asked some questions about debaters' opinion on adjudicator's way

in delivering feedback. The first debater the researcher interviewed was Debater A. She answered the researcher's question that she felt really contented with the coaching training of the adjudicator. She said the adjudicator's explanation was very clear and coherent so that it made her easy to follow.

The researcher then explored her thought on why she was very actively asking questions to adjudicator. She argued that sometimes she did not understand how to be a good second speaker; so she wanted to know some tips. Not to mention, she claimed that by questioning she had made sure that her perception was similar to adjudicator's perception.

The researcher also explored the debater's feeling when she was receiving feedback. Debater A answered that for the first time, she felt embarrassed but then she found the feedback very helpful for herself improvement. She mentioned that the feedback given made her to learn so that she would have more structured cases. She added when receiving feedback, she got used to motivate herself to think more logic like the adjudicator did. This condition carried her up to read more so that her knowledge of any issue can elevate.

Regarding to the activities she was doing while receiving feedback, the adjudicator then asked to debater about the meaning she produced utterances like "Yes..." "I got it..." "Hmmm..." and even nodding. Debater A clarified when she said "Yes" and "I got it...", it meant that she understood to the feedback while "Hmmm..." meant that she just knew any novel information from the adjudicator's feedback. She also added that nodding here meant she accepted the emergence of the feedback from the adjudicator. The researcher did not find any denial statement from the debater so that it can be implied debater A agreed and accepted all feedback given by the adjudicator.

The researcher also interviewed Debater B on the subject of her responses. The researcher asked Debater B why she did not give any question to the adjudicator. Debater B answered that she fully understood all the feedback the adjudicator gave. She thought that his feedback was very fruitful for her improvement. She, at times, made wrong set up as in the first speaker but the adjudicator directly corrected the set up. For instance, in the motion of THW pardon eco terrorism, she argued for committing eco terrorism instead of pardoning that action. In his feedback, he provided the more proper model of pardoning model. Thus, Debater B thought that his feedback has made her improved in term of setting up her model. Additionally, she explained the responsibility of first speaker is greater than the second speaker. In first speaker's hand, portrayal of the debate should be clear enough; therefore, she thought that it was

better for her to just follow the adjudicator's feedback. By this, the researcher can imply Debater B believed to the adjudicator.

The researcher also explored Debater B's thoughts and feelings when she was receiving feedback. Debater B said, for her, the feedback was also very helpful. What she felt during the feedback was being given was awareness. She asserted that through the feedback given, she realized about her mistakes from the cases she had made before. Unlike Debater A, she did not feel embarrassed at all rather she found highly motivated to have better performance after receiving feedback.

Regarding the activities that she had done, the researcher asked why she did not ask some questions to the adjudicator. Debater B argued that she did not need to do that because the feedback was adequately clear for her so she chose to not making any questions. When the researcher pertained about utterances Debater B produced, she answered that all utterances like "Yes..." "I got it..." "Hmmm..." meant she understood to the feedback and she accepted the feedback given. Like Debater A, the researcher barely found Debater B declined the adjudicator's feedback.

The researcher found that interview result also corresponds to the result from field note observation. Debater A responded by giving question because she wanted to make sure that her point of view was similar to the adjudicator's perspective. Meanwhile, Debater B did not ask something because she admitted that she frequently made wrong set up as first speaker. So, she just obeyed on what overall the adjudicator was saying in giving feedback. The responses of producing utterances "Yes, hmm, okay..." meant that they both understand and agree to what adjudicator was explaining. Most importantly, the researcher concluded that both debaters accepted the feedback and thought that the feedback was very clear and fruitful for their improvement.

The second research question is about how debaters respond to feedback given. The debaters' responses to the adjudicator's feedback were diversely for every single individual. It was normal because every individual has different strategy to absorb or interpret input they got (Lynch & Maclean, 2003). In this study, the feedback was only given to the Opening Opposition, which is Leader of Opposition and Deputy Leader of Opposition. They both are the winning team of EDS Unesa and the main subject in this study. The researcher found that the Leader of Opposition did minimum responses to the feedback while the Deputy Leader of Opposition's responses were more frequent. What meant

by minimum action is the activity done by the debaters when receiving the feedback.

She might produce some utterances like “yes”. It indicates that she approved to the adjudicator’s statement. This kind of agreement is very needed in any learning process the so called debating training due to the role of adjudicator is the coach of the debating club. It can be implied that she agreed that all the adjudicator had told is right. As feedback giver, the adjudicator has been literate to the issue (Freeley, 2013). When she said “*I got it*”, it means that she was able to receive and understand what the adjudicator is meant to say. This is decidedly important because feedback can only become so powerful if the receiver was able to hear and understand it (Brookhart, 2008).

She said “*hmm...*” indicating that she has just known some newly information or newly material from the adjudicator. By this, she expected to do better performance or to make more correct arguments or rebuttal in the next debates. It is good because the aim of feedback is self-reflecting upon learning development (Linch & Maclean (2003). This means that she acted as passive receiver who agree with the whole feedback the adjudicator has given. It can be seen also the moment when she took a new blank sheet to write down the new cases given by adjudicator through feedback.

In most tournaments, this also could happen. This part is really the most essential one to actually upgrade the skill of the debaters. Hattie and Timerley (2007) also state that feedback is one of the most prevailing influences on learning and achievement since it is the consequence of a performance. Through feedback, the students can look up the answers to evaluate the correctness of the response. Likewise, when the debaters are receiving feedback, for instance, related to the argument they build in debate, they would evaluate theirs that might be irrelevant or surficial.

The researcher found that all debaters agreed and accepted the feedback given. Even, they thought that the feedback was very helpful for them to improve themselves. This actually corresponds to Agudo (2013) and Garcia & Martinez (2018) findings. When the debaters see the feedback clear and useful, the debaters accept the feedback and did not give any denial action. They responded the feedback welcomed and accepted. They were satisfied due to the perceived clarity and usefulness of the feedback given. Moreover, Garcia & Martinez (2018) claimed that participants’ responses reveal some readiness for autonomous learning. Receiving corrective feedback could also reinforce the idea of a shared responsibility, which should in turn reassure the development of self-regulation behavior overlaying the way for autonomous learning. This suits

to the adjudicator’s treatment oh how directly command the debaters to recase and did their speech once more. In this stage of recasing, the debaters would actually can develop their autonomous learning.

CONCLUSION

After analyzing the data, the researcher found that the aspect of debate that is habitually concerned by the adjudicator is matter aspect. In matter aspect, the parts that he mostly focused was reasoning. The feedback about reasoning was oftentimes explained clearly by the adjudicator. Other part in matter aspects that he expounded in his feedback were rebuttal, stance, model, argument, definition, and example. The feedback about method was also given but the portion was not as rich as matter. It was all about strategy. The organization component was not mentioned. Surprisingly, the researcher hardly found the feedback about manner aspect. Feedback about manner was only given on vocal presentation aspect. Harvey (2011) claims that the matter or content aspect is being concerned by most adjudicator all around the world. Moreover, Quinn (2015) asserts no coaching can change the manner of debaters, the thing that can be done is how to make it more effective. The researcher also found that the responses of debaters were quite different. Nonetheless, the researcher concluded that both debaters accepted the feedback given and found feedback very helpful for their improvement.

SUGGESTIONS

The researcher suggests several actions both debater and adjudicator need to do. Firstly, debaters need to understand the concept of three aspects of debate. This research helps elucidate them about those three namely matter, manner and method. They need to consider them all especially the matter aspect. Secondly, for the adjudicators, they need to be ready to give contributive feedback to debaters. This research is very meaningful in term of illuminating other adjudicators that giving feedback about matter fruitfully is necessarily. Lastly, for the institution of debating club, in this case, EDS Unesa, they might hire another adjudicator for their training so that the feedback debaters receive will be more contributive and various.

This study reports to the extent of adjudicator’s focus on providing feedback and debater’s responses. Another different debate context research needed to be investigated in order to confirm that matter aspects are very important. Furthermore, the researcher also suggests that succeeding research could investigate the debaters’ strategy to absorb the adjudicator’s feedback.

REFERENCES

- Agudo, J.M. (2013). An Investigation into How EFL Learners Emotionally Respond to Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Colombian Applied Linguistics*, 15
- Ary, D., et al. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Virginia: ASCD
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *Journal of L2 UC Consortium for Language Learning & Teaching*, 1, 3-18
- Freely, A.J & Steinberg D.L. (2013). *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. New York: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Retrieved October 16th 2017 from <https://www.questia.com>
- Garcia, E.M. & Martinez, V.G.M. (2018). Student's Reactions to Teacher Corrective Feedback to Oral Production: A Study on Self-Correction and Autonomy in Compulsory EFL University Courses. *Journal of MEXTESOL*, 42
- Harvey, S.N. (2011). *The Practical Guide to Debating, World Style/British Parliamentary Style*. New York: International Debate Education Association. Retrieved October 16th 2017 from <https://www.questia.com>
- Hattie J. & Temperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Journal of Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112. Doi: 10.3102/003465430298487
- Kimova, B. (2015). The Role of Feedback in EFL Classes. *Journal of Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*, 199, 172-177. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.502
- Lewin, M.L. & Wakefield, J.A. (1983). Teaching Psychology through an Instructor-Debate Format. *Journal of Teaching Psychology*. Doi: 10.1207/15328023100220
- Linch, T & Maclean J. (2003). Effect of Feedback on Performance. *Journal of Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 12, 3-24
- Meany, J. & Shuster, K. (2003). *On That Point! An Introduction to Parliamentary Debate*. New York: International Debate Education Association. Retrieved October 16th 2017 from <https://www.questia.com>
- Rydhal, S. (2005). Oral Feedback in the English Classroom: Teachers' Thoughts and Awareness.
- Thornbury, S. (2015). *How to Teach Speaking*. London: Pearson Longman
- Quinn, S. (2015). *Debating*. Australia. Retrieved October 17th 2017 from <https://www.learndebating.com>